



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,321	04/21/2004	Shuichi Seki	042343	4230
38834	7590	01/17/2006		EXAMINER
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			DINH, TRINH VO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/828,321	SEKI, SHUICHI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Trinh Vo Dinh	2821	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 12/22/05.

2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's communication filed on 12/22/2005 has been carefully considered by the examiner. The arguments advanced therein are persuasive with respect to the rejections of record, and those rejections are accordingly withdrawn. In view of a further consideration, however, a new ground of rejection is set forth below. This action is not made final.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshimura Motomu (JP 2000-058260 of record).

Respecting claims 1 and 11, Motomu discloses, in Fig. 2 and abstract, a self light emitting display with a structure wherein a first electrode (1) is formed on a transparent substrate (6), light emitting pixels by a light emission functional layer (2+3+2) which is composed of at least one or more layers are formed on the first electrode (1), a second electrode (1) is formed on the light emission functional layer (2+3+2), and the second electrode is covered with a sealing member (5), characterized in that the first electrode is constructed so as to allow light from the light emitting pixels to pass through the transparent substrate side, that the second electrode is constructed so as to allow light from the light emitting pixels to pass through the sealing member side (abstract), and that at least a part of the sealing member (5) is formed of a light transmitting material.

Respecting claim 2, Motomu further discloses the first and second electrodes (1, 1) being formed of a light transmitting electrically conductive material.

Respecting claims 4-9 and 12-17, Motomu's structure would perform the claimed functions of a first light emitting area by the light emitting pixels formed in the transparent substrate side and a second light emitting area by the light emitting pixels formed in the sealing member side are formed on a same front and rear position respectively, the display area of the second light emitting area by the light emitting pixels formed in the sealing member side is smaller than that of the first light emitting area by the light emitting pixels formed in the transparent substrate side, a light emitting display pattern displayed on the first light emitting area and a light emitting display pattern displayed on the second light emitting area are displayed by a horizontally symmetrical pattern or by a vertically symmetrical pattern, and a dot matrix display device in which the light emitting pixels are arranged in a matrix pattern and by being constructed in such a way that a light emitting display pattern displayed on the first light emitting area and a light emitting display pattern displayed on the second light emitting area are displayed through a mirror inversion.

Respecting claim 19, Motomu disclose the light emitting pixels being constituted by organic EL elements (abstract).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motomu in view of Okada et al (US 6,858,271 of record).

Motomu further discloses, in abstract, the first electrode (1) being formed of a light transmitting electrically conductive material (abstract), that the other electrode (3) being formed of a metal material. However, Motomu does not suggest that at least one aperture being formed on a part of an electrode layer formed of the metal material. Okada discloses, in Fig. 2, apertures being formed on a part of an electrode layer (5) of the metal material (col. 14, lines 47+). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the second electrode of Motomu with apertures as taught by Okada in order to allow light emitting from emitting layer.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motomu in view of Kato (US 2004/0004594 of record).

Motomu discloses every feature of the claimed invention except polarizing plates. Kato discloses, in Fig. 1, polarizing plates (18, 21) whose polarizing surfaces are mutually perpendicular are arranged in the transparent substrate side and the seal member side, respectively, as the light emitting pixels are placed in a center between them. Since the use of a pair of polarizing on both sides of a light emitting element has been a well-known practice in the art to provide perpendicular polarization. Therefore, to provide Motomu with polarizing plates would have been obvious to one skill in the art.

6. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motomu in view of Toda (US 2004/0012531 A1 of record).

Motomu discloses every feature of the claimed invention except a discerning means.

Toda discloses a discerning means (hinge 19 in Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Motomu's device with a hinge as taught by Toda for the purpose of operating the display device in different states.

Respecting claim 20, Motomu disclose the light emitting pixels being constituted by organic EL elements (abstract).

***Inquiry***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh Vo Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong, can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Art unit 2821*

*January 12, 2006*

TRINH DINH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

